



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

June 25, 2003

Ms. Carol Longoria
Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2003-4400

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 183398.

The University of Texas (the "university") received a request for three categories of information related to university police department 1) weapons purchases, 2) correspondence, and 3) information for university police officers concerning the use of firearms distributed during a specified time period. The university forwarded the request to the University of Texas System (the "system") for handling. You state that you will release documents responsive to the first category of information. You state that you do not have any information responsive to the second category of information.¹ You claim that the information responsive to the third category is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(b) excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer

¹We note that a governmental body is not required to obtain information not in its possession. Open Records Decision No. 558 (1990).

safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release of forms containing information regarding location of off-duty police officers in advance would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (if information regarding certain burglaries exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under section 552.108), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers’ licenses), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted).

However, in order for a governmental body to claim this exception to disclosure, it must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Furthermore, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were different from those commonly known). Whether disclosure of particular records will interfere with law enforcement or prosecution must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-381 (1981).

You state that release of the submitted information would “permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of the State.” You further state that release of this information would have a “detrimental effect on the [university’s police department]’s ability to secure and protect both the University property and its population,” would provide information about which police vehicles may not carry weapons, and would “give anyone access to police schedules and protocols pertaining to the deposit and handling of weapons.” Finally, you have also submitted to this office a letter from the university’s chief of police, in which he objects to the release of the submitted information, asserting that the disclosure of “the dissemination and assignment of weapons to either a particular police vehicle or area would interfere with law enforcement operations and generally undermine police efforts to provide security.”

After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree that the system has adequately demonstrated that release of portions of the police memoranda would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. We have marked the submitted information accordingly. However, you have not met your burden of adequately demonstrating that release of the remaining submitted information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. We therefore conclude that the system may only withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be

sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Swanson", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/sdk

Ref: ID# 183398

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. William C. Reddick
1500 East Riverside Drive, #319
Austin, Texas 78741
(w/o enclosures)